

COLVIN'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

NO. 9]

WASHINGTON CITY, MARCH 12, 1808.

[VOL. 1.

and 10

MANIFESTO!

" TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

" Fellow Citizens,

" In the course of the events which have marked the conduct and characters of those to whom you have, at different periods, intrusted by your suffrages the power of making laws for your government, few measures have occurred, since the adoption of the present constitution, more extraordinary than the meeting lately held for the purpose of nominating a President and Vice President of the United States.

" Our alarm is equally excited, whether we advert to the mode in which the meeting was summoned, or to the proceedings after it was convened. The Senator who assumed the power of calling together the members of Congress, did it under the pretext of that power being vested in him by a former convention; this pretext, whether it be true or not, implies an assertion of a right in the Congress of 1804, to direct their successors in the mode of choosing the chief magistrate; an assertion which no man has ever before had the hardihood to advance. The notices were private; not general to all the members of the two houses; nor confined to the republican party; a delegate from one of the territories was invited and attended, a man who in elections has no suffrage, and in legislation no vote. The persons who met in pursuance of this unprecedented summons, proceeded without discussion or debate, to determine by ballot the candidates for the highest offices in the union. The

characters of different men, and their pretensions to the public favor, we were not suffered to be canvassed, and all responsibility was avoided by the mode of selection. The determination of this conclave has been published as the act of the republican party; and with as much exultation as the result of a solemn election by the nation. Attempts are making to impress upon the public mind, that these proceedings ought to be binding upon all the republicans, and those who refused to attend, or disapproved of the meeting, are denounced as enemies of liberty, and as apostates from the cause of the people. In this state of things, we think it our duty to address you, and we deem ourselves called upon to enter our most solemn protest against these proceedings.

" It is true that at former periods, when the election of a president and vice president approached, it was customary to hold meetings of the members of congress, for the purpose of recommending candidates to the public. But these meetings, if not justified, were palliated by the necessity of union. The federalists presented a formidable phalanx; and either to succeed at all, or to prevent them from placing the candidate for the vice presidency in the presidential chair, it was necessary to exert the combined efforts of the whole republican party. But it is equally true that in those instances, the nominations for the presidency were mere matters of course. In the first and second elections under the constitution, the eyes of all were turned upon General Washington, and since

the expiration of the two periods, during which he filled the supreme executive office, there has not until now been any difference of opinion among the republicans, as to the candidate for the first magistracy. The real object of all such former meetings, was to produce such a co-operation, as would secure the election of a republican vice president.

"The circumstances which might be urged in extenuation of such a measure heretofore, do not now exist.—The federalists are comparatively few in number, and form but a feeble party; they cannot give to any one candidate, more than sixteen or seventeen votes out of one hundred and seventy six; no federalist can therefore be elected by the electors; and should no person have a majority of all the electoral votes, the choice of the president will devolve on the present house of representatives, in which the federalists have the votes of only two states, Connecticut and Delaware. The alteration of the constitution prevents the danger of any intrigue, by which the intended vice president might be elected president. No good reason can therefore now be assigned, why an union of the republicans in favor of any particular person, should be attempted by a measure in itself so exceptionable, as a nomination by the senators and representatives in congress.

"We do not say that a consultation among the members of congress, respecting the persons to be recommended as candidates for the two highest offices of the nation, may not in some extraordinary crisis, be proper, but the propriety must arise from absolute necessity. Even then, we doubt whether it can be completely justified. The people ought to exercise their right of election without any undue

bias; and is it not the evident intention of such consultations to produce a bias? Besides, in the event of there being no election by the electors, the choice of the president devolves on the house of representatives, and that of the vice president on the senate: Should the house of representatives not succeed in electing the president, the vice president will become the chief magistrate; hence the impropriety of nominations by the members of congress, is more glaring, as it may become the political interest of the representatives to prevent an election by the electors, and of the senators to frustrate any choice by either. Nor is this all; a danger of more than ordinary magnitude arises from the influence which may be used by the president, over meetings of any individuals at the seat of government. The hope, or the promise of office may be employed to induce a nomination either of himself, or of a favorite successor, and it requires but little sagacity to foresee the consequences of such corruption.

"So conscious were the members who attended the late meeting, of the weight of objections which might be urged against their proceedings, that they have thought it proper to publish an exculpatory resolution, proposed by Mr. Giles of Virginia, and unanimously adopted. They have declared, that in "making their nominations, they have acted only in their individual characters as citizens;" this is very true, because they could act in no other, without a breach of their oaths, and a direct violation of the letter of the constitution. But was it not intended that those nominations should be enforced by the sanction of congressional names?—They proceed to assert "that they have been induced to adopt this mea-

sure from the necessity of the case, from a deep conviction of the importance of union to the republicans throughout all parts of the U. States, in the present crisis of both our external and internal affairs." We trust we have shewn that no such necessity exists, and that an union among the republicans, in favor of any individual, is not important.—We acknowledge that the aspect of our foreign affairs is unpromising. We are, perhaps on the eve of a war with one of the great powers of Europe; we are therefore strongly impressed with the difficulties of our situation. In such a crisis it unanimity in the choice of a president is necessary, that choice should be directed to a man, eminently calculated by his tried energy and talents, to conduct the nation with firmness and wisdom, through the perils which surround it; to a man who had not in the hour of terror and persecution, deserted his post, and sought in obscurity and retirement, a shelter from the political tempest; to a man not suspected of undue partiality or enmity to either of the present belligerent powers; to a man who had not forfeited his claim to public confidence, by recommending a shameful bargain with the unprincipled speculators of the Yazoo companies, a dishonorable compact with fraud and corruption. Is James Madison such a man? We ask for energy, and we are told of his moderation; we ask for talents, and the reply is his unassuming merit; we ask what were his services in the cause of public liberty, and we are directed to the pages of the *Federalist*, written in conjunction with Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, in which the most extravagant of their doctrines are maintained and propagated. We ask

for consistency as a republican, standing forth to stem the torrent of oppression, which once threatened to overwhelm the liberties of the country; we ask for that high and honorable sense of duty, which would at all times turn with loathing and abhorrence from any compromise with fraud and speculation; we ask in vain.

"But further. One of the reasons, assigned by Mr. Jefferson for declining to stand again as a candidate for the chair of the chief magistrate, is the propriety of a rotation in that office. The great advantage of this principle of rotation is, that by appointing as a successor to the present officer, a man not immediately connected with him, the acts of the administration may be impartially reviewed; those measures which tend to promote the public good will be adopted, and those of a contrary tendency, which from the fallibility of human nature may have been pursued, will be abandoned, and if necessary, exposed. All other rotation is a mockery.

"We do therefore in the most solemn manner protest against the proceedings of the meeting held in the senate chamber on the twenty-third day of January last, because we consider them—

"As being in direct hostility to the principles of the constitution:

"As a gross assumption of power not delegated by the people, and not justified or extenuated by any actual necessity:

"As an attempt to produce an undue bias in the ensuing election of president and vice-president, and virtually to transfer the appointment of those officers from the people, to a majority of the two houses of congress.

"And we do in the same manner protest against the nomination of James Madison, as we believe him to be unfit to fill the office of president in the present juncture of our affairs.

*Joseph Clay,
Abram Trigg,
Jno. Russell,
Josiah Masters,
George Clinton, jr.
Gurdon S. Mumford,
John Thompson,
Peter Swart,
Edwin Gray,
W. Hoge,
Samuel Smith,
Danl. Montgomery,
John Harris,
Saml. Maclay,
David R. Williams,
James M. Garnett,
John Randolph.*

"City of Washington, }
Feb. 27th, 1808." }

MANIFESTO.—In the preceding part of this number of the Register, will be found a flaming manifesto from John Randolph and others against the nomination of Mr. Madison for the Presidency. But John has mistaken his place in the line of signatures; and, instead of *heading* the corps, he *tails* it. The array of the squadron is like the horned snake, and symbolical of the spirit by which it is actuated, being urged on by the deadly venom which rankles in its rear. Nobody will mistake Joseph Clay for the captain, although he marches in front. I said two years ago that Joseph was John's lieutenant.

The public are to understand, I presume, that this manifesto contains all the objections against the conventional proceedings on the 23d of January last; and that it is a specimen of the abilities and the

taste of the political protestants whose names are subscribed to it. Considering that they are "all *honorable* men," I confess that it has rather surprised me that the production has appeared in so mawkish a dress. I should, indeed, have expected from Mr. Abram Trigg's fancy a more comely habiliment for the manifesto than it wears; and I am confident if it had been left to his sole judgment to decide, the decorations of the piece would have been equally captivating and agreeable with his own irresistible person: But what shall I say to John Randolph, who has been called the *eloquent* John Randolph! when such a miserable, ungracious bantling, deformed in all its parts, is thrust upon the world without a solitary ornament? I know that John is not the natural parent of the brat; but he is certainly the godfather.

The malcontents set out with telling us, that the convention at the capitol was an "*extraordinary*" measure. If the gentlemen were punsters, I would certainly allow them the merit of having selected a happy expression: But when I recollect the solemn seriousness of the subject, and contemplate the intrepid countenance of Josiah Masters; I cannot believe the phrase was meant to produce a smile. If the word is intended to explain that the members of congress did not act in their capacity of legislators in making the nomination, then, I grant you, the measure was "*extra-ordinary*;" or, over and above the ordinary transactions of the legislature, for it is very certain they did not pretend to act in their legislative capacity: But if, by "*extraordinary*," is meant to be conveyed the idea that the proceeding stands alone and without a precedent, it is contradicted by the manifesto it-

self, is that part where the dissenters acknowledge, "It is true, that at former periods, when the election for president and vice president approached, it was customary to hold meetings of the members of congress, for the purpose of recommending candidates to the public." If the thing was "customary," it assuredly could not be "extraordinary." Men who thus contradict themselves will have very little weight or consideration with the public. It is beyond the wit of John Randolph or of Joseph Clay to reconcile such a gross solecism.

"Our ALARM is equally excited (they inform us) whether we advert to the mode in which the meeting was summoned, or to the proceedings, after it was convened." Such a confession was entirely unnecessary: Every friend of Mr. Madison knew that John Randolph and a few others were panic struck on the first intimation of a convention; and their "alarm was equally excited," (by which they mean it was not diminished,) when they came to a knowledge of the "proceedings after it was convened." In both cases, their trepidation was alike: They knew that James Madison would be the choice of the meeting. They were, in truth, "alarmed." But for *what* were they alarmed? For the safety of the constitution? For the independence of the country? For the rights of the people? No, Sir! I apprehend not. Who will believe that the blazing patriotism (so hot that it scorches!) which these men profess, could lie dormant for upwards of thirty days and thirty nights, before it found vent in even a puling declaration, if these men really had thought the nomination of Mr. Madison so extremely dangerous and alarming? Twenty-six days elapsed from the publica-

tion of the conventional proceedings before Joseph Clay took his seat in the house, forced back as he was by his constituents, and seven or eight days more (if I may credit the date) before this alarming manifesto was drawn up. John Randolph too, that iron-hearted patriot, could find moments at the period, so alarmingly described, to soothe his sorrows in the company of that notorious lover of his country, Philip Barton Key! All that time we heard nothing from these conscientious politicians; a circumstance which, like a death-bed repentance, occasions strong suspicions of hypocrisy.

Might it not with more propriety be supposed, all things considered, that the manifesto has been forced into existence by the venomous spleen of one or two individuals personally hostile to Mr. Madison? From the 23d of January to the 27th of February, was a long time for drawing up so wretched a performance. Was the period not spent in *sounding the waters*? And look at the date and the time of publication. On the 27th of February it was penned, but was not published till the 7th of March! Nine days, it seems, were requisite to enlist seventeen men into the service; not quite so long, to be sure, as the Greeks spent in the reduction of Troy, but certainly long enough to raise a whole regiment of signers, where the affair was represented to be so "extraordinary" and "alarming."

The "senator who assumed the power of calling together the members of congress," is next assailed. It is said he "did it under the pretext of a power vested in him by a former convention;" and that "this pretext implies an assertion of a right in the congress of 1804 to direct their suc-

cessors in the mode of choosing the chief magistrate." I acknowledge the right that every man possesses to build up what fanciful theories he pleases. Vagaries of that kind rarely do any injury. We are presented with a pretty sample of them in the preceding quotation. "The senator used a *pretext*, and the pretext implies a power," &c. Such is the farago of honorable men! Every person of common understanding knows that in order to have a meeting, some notification must be circulated to bring it about; and it is of very little consequence who is the person that notifies, so that he is respectable and intelligent. There was, however, a peculiar propriety in general Bradley's calling the late convention: He had been president of the convention in 1804, when Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Clinton were nominated, and at which John Randolph and a majority of the signers of the manifesto attended, and were as busy as any body at the place of meeting. His being of Vermont, also, a state which has kept itself very much aloof from all practices that might be either justly or unjustly branded with the name of intrigue, and his distinguished republicanism, made it extremely in character for him to officiate. Indeed the confidence placed in him by the convention of 1804, at which John Randolph and most of his followers attended, and to which confidence as president of that meeting gen. Bradley refers, merely by way of apology and explanation for his stepping forward on the late occasion, pointed him out as the very man who ought to issue the notification. Not a whisper of disapprobation was heard from any one, except from those who were known to be hostile to Mr. Madison, from a motive which they

were afraid to avow. The address of general Bradley to the members of congress when they assembled on the 23d of January in the present year, is amply sufficient to tranquilize the most angry heart that beats against the measure, provided it is impelled by an honest bias. He expressed himself in these terms:

"Gentlemen—You must have perceived the anxiety and the agitation of the public mind, ever since it has been announced that the president of the U. S. contrary to the expectations of many, and the wishes of the great body of the American people; would decline a future election. The eyes of the nation have been turned to this place, and appear to be waiting with earnest expectation. This event was no sooner made known than the tools of intrigue were set at work, and secret cabals were put in motion. Rumors were engendered in various parts of the union, assuming the character of legitimate information from Washington. Reports have been circulated of meetings at this place that were never held; of nominations that were never made; and of measures taken by the republicans that never existed; tending to distract and divide the public opinion, disunite the republican interest, and to endanger the peace, union and safety of these states. To counteract the baneful tendency of secret intrigues and disorganization it appeared indispensably necessary at this important crisis, that a public meeting of the republican members of congress should take place. Their knowledge of eminent characters would enable them to form correct opinions. For that purpose I did, on the 19th instant, under authority of the flattering confidence bestowed upon me at the republican meeting held on the 25th of Februa-

ry 1804, address a circular note to all the republican members, and, indeed to all the members of congress, excepting five members of the senate and twenty-three members of the house of representatives; who were omitted, not from any want of respect to their characters, or the states they represent, but from the delicate situation in which they stood. Having never acted with the republicans, it was to be feared that an address to them would not be cordially received, or by them be considered within the line of that civility, or marked with that respect and decorum which ought to regulate the conduct of one member towards another radically differing in political principles. In the circular note I denominated the meeting a *convention*; not from any desire or apprehension that any member when assembled, would consider himself as possessing any other power or influence than that of a well informed citizen, acting in his private and individual capacity; but to avoid every kind of expression which might be tortured into a meaning different from the real intention, or afford those who had been among the first to recommend this mode of procedure a pretext (for which some seem to pant) to raise an outcry and clamor against it. The subject is now before you; and whether the meeting will proceed at this time, or postpone the consideration thereof to a future day, or determine to make no nominations, the proceedings being made public will prevent the minds of our fellow-citizens from being deceived and misled by intrigues and false reports."

Such was the manly exposition of the case by gen. Bradley. In this we find nothing to "imply the assertion of a right in the congress of 1804 to direct their successors in the mode of

choosing the chief magistrate." It was explicitly for the purpose of coming to a correct understanding; to put down the wicked machinations of the artful, and to advise the public of the person who, in the estimation of intelligent men, was best qualified to be the successor of Mr. Jefferson.

Surely it comes with a fatal grace from such men as John Randolph and Joseph Clay, to denounce the late convention. And what a spirit do they exemplify! They are willing to seal their own reprobation if they can but destroy the man they hate; and in the fullness of their wrath commit political suicide to effect the ruin of Mr. Madison. They could not discover, unhappy gentlemen, that nominations by members of congress was an usurpation of power, until the 27th day of February, 1808; although four years before they had acted as masters of a similar ceremony! The manifesto is the "Confessional of the Black Penitents," indeed. Religion has often been a masque for the most wicked deeds, and the "solemn protest" of many a furious patriot conceals, too frequently, the most vindictive passions. The year preceding an election is truly fruitful in professions of tender attachment for the rights of the people. Disappointment and chagrin too often put on the austere garb of rigid republicanism, and with less plausibility than Peter the Hermit, preach up a crusade. Thank God, the people of this country are too sensible and too virtuous to be moved by these deceptive outcries. The holy land, these independent and free states, are still in the hands of the faithful; where I hope they may long continue in defiance of political infidels or apostates.

"The notices (the protestants complain) were private; not general

to all the members of the two houses ; nor confined to the republican party." This singular phraseology might induce a careless reader to believe that the notification was made with the utmost secrecy : But what kind of privacy is that, where *more than one hundred printed notices were circulated*, without the least injunction to keep them from the public eye ? I published the notice in the Register on the day of the meeting, and the intended convention was known throughout the city, and particularly to every member of congress here, several days before. It bore date the 19th of January, and the meeting was not held until the 23d. A copy was directed and sent to every one whose name is signed to the protest that was in Washington at the time. Does Josiah Masters dare to put his name to the assertion that "the notices were private," without trembling for the character of his veracity ? Was he not the very man who posted the notification up in the house of representatives and in the senate chamber, with a counter-invitation of his own, of ludicrous complexion, from which a copy was taken by a stenographer and forwarded for publication in a daily gazette ? And are these the *honorable men*, with such a tale in their mouths, who "deem themselves called upon to enter their *most solemn protest against the proceedings*" of the convention ? Wave thy wand, O Mercury ! in glorious triumph over these, thine illustrious votaries.

But the notices were "not general to all the members of the two houses." That is, the federalists were not invited. I presume the address of gen. Bradley sufficiently explains the reason. But how long is it, I solicit to know, since an omission to invite federalists to a republican meet-

ing became a cause of reproach to the friends of free principles ? Does it originate in that intimate connexion which Mr. Randolph has lately encouraged with the most bitter enemies of his old principles ; or is it in return for those showers of fulsome eulogy which federal prints delight to pour upon him ?

They tell us too, that the notices were not "confined to the *republican party*." This assertion, the advancement of which betrays at once the weakness and the nakedness of their objections, is founded on the circumstance of Mr. John Quincy Adams having been present at the convention. I can tell the manifesto men *why* he was there. Ever since the outrage on the Chesapeake, Mr. Adams has conducted himself generally in a style of the noblest patriotism. He had indignantly thrown off the trammels of his party, broke through all their prejudices, and stood forth, in the spirit of a man, for the interests of his country. He was *therefore* invited ; for, although he had borne the name of a federalist, his *deeds* had proclaimed him a man of *true principles*. He had acted precisely the reverse of John Randolph. He suffered no little peevish, personal motives to induce him to thwart and distract the counsels of his country at a perilous moment : But he advanced like an American, like a man impressed with a proper sense of his own dignity, and like one who felt for the bleeding honor of his country.

He has received the curses of his party for it. Such is the fact ; such is the circumstance on which the malcontents bottom their declaration that the notices were not "confined to the republican party." Mr. Adams is the only one invited, who could be supposed to belong to the old federal

party; he was the only one that attended. I submit it for the public to determine, whether it is not honorable in the republicans to have shown this courtesy to a gentleman who has so well deserved the praise of honest hearts; and whose conduct, compared to that of John Randolph and that of some others, is like a glittering star to the pale gleam of a glow worm.

By what rule of reason is it made a crime for a delegate of a territory to have attended the meeting? Although "in elections he has no suffrage and in legislation no vote;" yet the president of the United States being the paramount executive of the territories, renders the selection of a good man for the office a business of high concern to every inhabitant of those dependencies of the Union; and if one solitary delegate should have attended as a spectator, where is the offence? Would John Randolph deny him even that poor consolation; and because "in elections he has no suffrage and in legislation no vote," tread him fairly down into the very mire of servitude?

The dissenters complain that there was no "discussion or debate." What a dreadful accusation! This, I confess, to Mr. Abram Trigg, had he been there, would have been a terrible deprivation. But wherefore complain of a circumstance so frivolous? If the gentlemen who met in convention were all satisfied as to the most suitable character to fill the office of President, what possible offence could it give to those who did not attend? Why should the meeting have been pestered with words? "The characters of different men" were well known; their "pretensions to the public favor" had long ago been "cavaused;" and neither the pert affectation of John Randolph's tongue,

nor the dull, monotonous drawl of Joseph Clay's voice, could have thrown one more solitary ray of light into the convention. They might, indeed, have railed at Mr. Madison, as they have done pretty freely in their manifesto; but with all their skill in defamation, they could not have detracted one particle from his merits.

But there was, it seems, no "responsibility" incurred by the meeting, because the question was "determined by ballot." Surely these men are mad. "Responsibility!"—What, Sirs! in an unconstitutional meeting! In an "extraordinary," in an "alarming" assemblage! Here is, indeed, strange doctrine: First the members of congress are denounced for having met in convention at all; and then they are decried for not having followed particular rules when they met. What puerility is this! If the meeting was in itself wrong; no mode of procedure could make it right. But do not the gentlemen admit the legitimacy of the convention, by pointing out what in their estimation were the proper rules of action? And do they not fairly beg the question when they attempt to demonstrate the illegality of the meeting from the method of voting by ballot without discussion? Or are we rather to consider the manifesto as a second bed of Procrustes, where facts and reason are stretched or curtailed to adjust them to its dimensions?

"The determination of the conclave has been published as the act of the republican party." As far as it goes it certainly is. Of what other party can it be called the act? It is surely not the act of the *federal* party. If there are republicans who do not approve of it, that only demonstrates that there exists a slight difference of

opinion on a great question, wherein at all times a large party will not agree unanimously ; which is more a matter of regret than of recrimination. So far as the public sentiment has been made known on the subject, the determination of the convention has been approved by the majority of republicans in the country ; and where the majority declare in favor of a measure, it ought to have a salutary influence on the minority of the same party. It is the vital principle of all governments and all parties, without which they cannot exist. I ask the malcontents what measure would ever be adopted by any party, if it were necessary to a decision that every member should concur in it ? But it is not true, as the manifesto proclaims, that "those who refused to attend, or disapproved of the meeting, are denounced as enemies of liberty, and as apostates from the cause of the people." The denunciation came originally from the enemies of the convention, for the truth of which assertion I appeal to the answer of Edwin Gray to general Bradley's invitation, and the thousand bellowing communications that were sent to the press by the malcontents, even before the meeting took place. The friends of the conventional proceedings bore much before they retorted ; and every sentence they have uttered has been in the honorable cause of self-defence. They endeavored to soften the asperities of anger, to assuage the anguish of disappointment ; until forbearance became pusillanimity and silence a dereliction of dignity. Drawn out in their own vindication, their warfare has been manly and generous, their arguments irresistible. Truth is their weapon ; and victory already perches on their standard.

Sensible of the weakness of their

cause, the dissenters occupy a considerable portion of their manifesto in attempting to purge themselves of inconsistency of conduct, in having sanctioned a former convention and in denouncing the last. And what does all their sophistry resolve itself into ? Simply, "absolute necessity" in the one case ; and the "feebleness of the federal party" in the other. I am willing to meet the gentlemen on their own ground. What was the situation of parties in this country when, as the manifesto admits, "a consultation among the members of congress, respecting the persons to be recommended as candidates for the two highest offices of the nation," was justified by an "extraordinary crisis ?" There were then no bickerings among republicans ; they stood as a solid mass, actuated by one spirit ; it is acknowledged by the protestants that "there had not then been any difference of opinion among the republicans, as to the candidate for the first magistracy ;" the strength of the federal party induced the friends of freedom to act unanimously ; one sentiment among the latter pervaded the continent ; one genius seemed to direct them ; the vice-president was a mere secondary consideration ; for a vice-president is no cabinet minister, has no vote in the executive department, can neither thwart a good measure nor influence a bad one ; he is president of the senate and a commissioner of the sinking fund, and that is all he is : United then, heart in hand, in favor of one man for president, and coupling with him another republican, whose success would naturally depend on the success of the first, where was the "*absolute necessity*" of a convention in 1804, or at any previous period ? From the earliest establishment of our government down

to Mr. Jefferson's declension of the office, the republican sentiment has been rivetted to him; it was the general understanding of the people; it required no consultation, no convention to designate him as the man of their choice; his image was on every mind, and his name was familiar to every republican tongue: Yet, with this confession in their manifesto, the signers have the effrontery to declare that *then there was an "absolute necessity"* for a meeting of republican members of congress to agree upon the candidate. Even the paltry excuse drawn from the vice-president fails them in the case of 1804; for at the very time that convention was held, it was reduced to a certainty the amendment to the constitution relative to the election of that officer would go into effect. And yet such is that imperious, that justifiable, that "*absolute necessity*" of which they speak!!

But what is the case at present, by their own acknowledgment? "There has not, until *now*, been any difference of opinion among the republicans." There *is*, then, "*now a difference of opinion*" among them as to the candidate for president. What time, therefore, so proper for a consultation? What other necessity more urgent, more cogent, could exist for a convention? "*A difference of opinion*" exists: What other method, then, so proper, so excellent, as a meeting of the members of congress, of men of intelligence, in the confidence of the people, from all parts of the Union, to heal that "*difference*" as far as possible; to ascertain how the public mind stood with respect to the various men at that time in the public eye for the office of president; to designate the man in whose favor the greatest number of republicans would unite; and

to prevent discord from going abroad among the citizens, to the destruction of the friends of liberty? Even admitting that the federalists could not, in any event, elect a president, does that prove that the republicans ought to leave every thing to chance, to take no measure for securing the elevation of a man the most qualified for president among their own party? In estimable things there are degrees of comparison; and in seeking for a chief magistrate among republicans it is incumbent on the people to select *the best*. But, indeed, the signers of the manifesto very bluntly tell us that they care little about "*an union* of the republicans in favor of any particular person." I believe them, with all my soul. Their object is *distraction! division! confusion!* In a general scramble they no doubt think they may come off handsomely: They are good at over-reaching, perhaps, in politics, and are willing to trust to their skill in seizing upon circumstances in a general uproar!—What is *union* to such a man as John Randolph? He never would act cordially in unison with the republicans in congress; but followed his own ungovernable bent; towering for a lofty character over the heads of his peers; and with the words of democracy in his mouth, playing the supercilious tyrant in his political actions. He want "*union*," *indeed!* No, Sirs! Without the abilities of Cæsar, he has the foulest, the meanest of his passions. He would rather rule the Lilliputian band of seventeen, and personate Gildrig, than act in concert and on equal terms with the most luminous characters in the national legislature.

To the assertion that "the people ought to exercise their right of election without any undue bias," I

answer that it is incumbent on the malcontents to prove that the bias which the nomination of Mr. Madison is calculated to produce is an *undue* one. I think it is a *due* bias, if in truth, it be a bias foreign to the real sentiments of the people. That is the point on which I wish to meet his opponents. It is *due* to his virtues; it is *due* to his great abilities; it is *due* to his eminent services to his country; and if there is any *undue* bias in the case, it is that which John Randolph and Joseph Clay have so earnestly labored to create against him.

With what assurance do these protestants conjure up a frightful spectre on the imaginary corruption of the congress, in case of a failure of a choice by the electors! How ingenious they are in *supposing* a case. They do well to resort to *conjecture* who cannot adduce *facts* to support them. But it is a little unfortunate that their supposition is borne out only by another supposition of the most monstrous kind! To support the possibility of their apprehensions, it is necessary for them to imagine a time when the whole legislature must be guilty of PERJURY! "It may become the political interest of the representatives to prevent an election by the electors, and of the senators to frustrate any choice by either." This case, I venture to say, *cannot* happen. If it could occur; if ever the whole body of congress could become so profligate, so abandoned, so excessively wicked, there is a remedy above all remedies—the political compact would be dissolved, and the people would find a cure for the evil in the bayonet. As little can that time be looked for or dreaded, when the members of congress shall be so corrupted and debased, as for "the hope or the promise of office," to be induced to make "a nomination either

of an existing president or of a favorite successor." I should be sorry to say that the malcontents find countenance for their foul forebodings in the obsequiousness of their own feelings; but why do they not tell us in what portion of the American people they have witnessed such debasement as to give any color to their suppositions? In what class of citizens will they find examples of such shameless depravity, such detestable corruption, such black-hearted perjury, as they tell us may prevail? I know that these questions will not be answered; for the last resort of detected cunning is stubborn silence.

The dissenters acknowledge it to be "very true," that in making the nominations the members of the convention "acted only in their individual characters as citizens." "But (say they) was it not intended that those nominations should be enforced by the sanction of congressional names?" I am not versed in the language of quibble, and therefore I am not very certain that I understand what they mean by "enforcing nominations by the sanction of congressional names?" I may be allowed to state, however, on that point, what I do believe. It was intended by every one who met in convention, to fix on the best man for president, according to the most upright conviction of the fitness of character; and afterwards to support the nomination with that fidelity which belongs to the disciples of a good cause, and with that degree of honest zeal which always animates men who are engaged in a patriotic undertaking. I fancy there is nothing equivocal in this explanation: It admits of no perversion, and is what a virtuous republican may safely avow to the people.

But in what capacity, permit me to enquire, do the malcontents step forth?

Is it in their individual, or in their congressional character? Is it by the authority of the people, or from their own mere motion, that they act? And did they not intend that their objections to Mr. Madison "should be enforced by the sanction of congressional names?" If a majority of the members of congress had no right to recommend, by what right do the minority presume to protest? Permit me to tell them that the people will easily see through so shallow an artifice. The publication of their manifesto is a complete satire on their own protestations.

The gentlemen want a man of "tried energy and talents." I presume they pant for a "reign of terror and proscription." I had thought, indeed, that the desire for more energy was the peculiar characteristic of federalists; but some of our modern politicians are like the Satyr's visitor, blowing hot and cold with the same breath. The truth is, the federalists had spread a kind of rumor some time back that Mr. Madison was a man of no nerve, and the malcontents seized the hacknied charge, not having ingenuity enough to invent another. But I can tell them they are deceived. When John Randolph and Joseph Clay shrunk from the British lion, James Madison boldly took that animal by the jaws; and I now aver that it was because the Secretary of state had firmness enough to resist the aspiring pretensions of John Randolph, that the latter denounced him. I shall tell a pretty tale about this business by and by; and then the Russells, and the Masters, and the Grays, will discover what a pickle they have got into, with Joseph at their head and John at their tail.

Did Mr. Madison really "desert his post in the hour of terror and

persecution?" John Randolph's political remembrancer might have taught him better. Let him "get to his closet," and there study over the ephemeris of facts, and he will find that it was not to seek "a shelter from the political tempest" that Mr. Madison retired from the national legislature; but to rally the democracy of Virginia in the legislaure of that state, where in proud array with his compatriots he beat down the alien and sedition laws. And where is the evidence of his "enmity or partiality for either of the present belligerent powers?" This is another federal allegation, which the poor brains of the manifesto makers have pillaged from the vocabulary of opposition calumnies. The veriest driveller of a newspaper writer in the land would debase himself by scraping up such an obsolete invective against the Secretary. Mr. Jefferson has been stigmatized in the same way by his enemies all his life, but it never had any effect in tarnishing his reputation. Neither will it affect Mr. Madison. The same thing was adduced against col. Monroe with much more plausibility in the days of the French executive directory. Let us have the proof of this accusation. Yes, Sirs, —gentle, protesting Sirs! —I say the proof! or the people will fix a mark upon you, which in all probability you may very well deserve, but which I do not intend to soil this page by mentioning.

"A shameful bargain with the unprincipled speculators of the Yazoo companies," is next brought up as a formidable objection to Mr. Madison. A more outrageous, flagitious, unprincipled, wicked misrepresentation was never uttered against any man than this is. "A shameful bargain!" Are the protestants acquaint-

ed with the *truth* of the case? If they are I pity their hearts; if they are not, what can be said of their heads! Look up the report in the case made by Albert Gallatin, Levi Lincoln and James Madison, and all the facts will appear—a plain, simple narrative, without a single, solitary expression of approbation of what col. Troup very emphatically calls the “foul monster Yazoo.” Look it up; look it over, investigate the acts and the report, and it will be seen to the confusion and shame of the malcontents, that James Madison, acting as a mere commissioner in the case, reported solely as to the expediency of a peculiar mode of settling equitable claims which previous laws and conventions had pointed out and partly authorised; that in the capacity in which he acted he must have considered himself bound by previous pacts and agreements to report as he did. I declare in the face of the whole country, that James Madison, secretary of state, has always abhorred the Yazoo fraud, and has declared it to be the foulest act that ever stained the annals of a nation. I call upon his enemies to defend themselves; and to show, either from his words or his actions, that he has entertained other sentiments. They *dare not* descend to *particulars*. Even that fragment of Pocahontas, who *tails* the protest, with all his intrepidity of physiognomy, will avoid the enquiry.

But “fair and softly!” In the journal of the first session of the eighth congress, (about the same time Mr. Madison, in conjunction with Messrs. Gallatin and Lincoln, made the report respecting the Yazoo claims,) pages 297, 298, will be found the names of Joseph Clay, John Randolph, and the sweet-scented Mr. Abram Trigg, in favor of a motion

for hearing at the bar of the house of representatives, in person, the agent or agents for the Yazoo company: And in the journal of the first session of the ninth congress (about two years ago) will be seen, at page 393, the name of John Russel, voting against the rejection of a bill from the senate which provided for “indemnification” to the Yazoo claimants.—*Sirs! I speak to the record; and no subterfuge will avail you.*

I do not alledge it as a positive vice in these men that they voted in that way. But with what countenance can they come forward and charge Mr. Madison with an act of which he is not more guilty than themselves? If John Randolph continues to inculpate the secretary of state on such flimsy pretexts, it may probably be suspected that his rampant opposition to the Yazoo claims has been nothing more than a political manœuvre to render Mr. Madison odious. Such a presumption would by no means want the color of likelihood, for if we reflect on his previous silence and favorable vote, and his subsequent clamor on the subject, and mark the coincidence of the period at which that clamor commenced and the time of his first denunciation of the secretary, there appears a marvellous connection between them. If such be the fact, his patriotism is dog-cheap; and from an opposer of corruption he becomes a mere blusterer for political purposes.

With singular conceit the manifesto plays off a farce of question and answer. “We ask (it says) for energy [still harping on *energy*] and we are told of his moderation; we ask for talents, and the reply is his unassuming merit; we ask what were his services in the cause of public liberty, and we are directed to the pages of

the Federalist, written in conjunction with Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, in which the most extravagant of their doctrines are maintained and propagated." Such is the curious method of catechising which the malcontents have assumed. They might have proceeded in this style to the end of their chapter; and considering with what facility they fabricate their inquiries and answers, have satisfied themselves completely in every particular. They are perfect Bobadils in their way, and kill a man's character by computation.

Moderation I know is not pleasing to men of violent tempers or of crooked views; but if I do not much mistake the character of my countrymen, that temperament of mind will not lessen Mr. Madison in their estimation. A steady, firm moderation, is the very quality that a chief magistrate ought to possess. It is that very trait in the character of our present illustrious president which endears him so much to the people. Had he been a political salamander and rushed on all occasions into the fire of faction, John Randolph would, perhaps, have liked it better, but what would have become of the country? "Unassuming merit" has always been received, I believe, as the index of inherent talents; but the advocates of Mr. Madison can point to recorded services, to indelible marks of a sound judgment and a penetrating genius. I beg leave to introduce the reader to some of them: He was

A. D. 1776. Elected a member of the Virginia convention, when the present government of that state was formed; soon afterwards elected into the executive council, where he continued till 1779:

1779. Delegated to represent Virginia in the congress which sat in this

year, and continued in that body till the latter part of 1783, when he became ineligible under the confederation, which limited the service of a member to three years:

1784. Elected a member of the Virginia assembly, when he made some efforts to give to congress resources to comply with the engagements of the nation; and was mainly instrumental in carrying through the legislature of his state the revised code of laws, which had been adapted to republican principles; together with the bill for religious freedom, which made a part of the work:

1785. Re-elected to the Virginia assembly, and proposed the convention at Annapolis for making a change in the confederation. This opened the way for our present happy constitution:

He was afterwards elected by the unanimous vote of the Virginia legislature, a delegate in convention at Philadelphia, which framed the instrument of national union:

About the same time he was re-elected a member of the old congress:

The debates in the Virginia Convention (a book in print) give an ample specimen of his able and eloquent support of the existing constitution.

Elected a member of the first house of representatives under that compact:

Served eight years in that body during general Washington's administration:

Again took his stand in the Virginia legislature, when the torrent could no longer be resisted in congress, and there prepared and carried through his celebrated report against the alien and sedition laws, which gave federalism its first death-blow:

Has served seven years as secretary of state with Mr. Jefferson, being

his faithful counsellor and confidential adviser.

In this last station his able defence of the rights of the nation in his public writings and instructions to foreign ministers have done him immortal honor. When the recent negotiation with Great Britain is disclosed, I prognosticate for the secretary a rich harvest of glory.

Thus it is seen that from the year 1776, for a period of thirty two years, there is scarcely one annual period of his life which is not dotted with some act of public service, some admirable display of talent, or some magnanimous effort to ameliorate the condition of his country.

When the malcontents publish another protest, I imagine they will not exclaim, as they have done, "We ask in vain."

There is some share of cunning, I confess, in the allusion to the "Federalist;" a work which was written expressly for the purpose of recommending the present constitution of the Union to the people. It was originally published by numbers in the newspapers, and penned at a period when the present distinctions of party did not exist. It is a work in which the secretary of state has no occasion to regret his having taken a part; for it is an able commentary on the provisions of the national compact, and was undertaken for the noblest purposes. The best answer to the insinuation that Mr. Madison acted in derogation of his republican character in that instance, is the "Federalist" itself, to which I refer the reader. The whole tenor of his political life is a complete refutation of the accusation that the secretary thought or acted in unison with Jay or Hamilton in any of their unconstitutional doctrines; and the

particular proof is, that the moment they deviated from the original principles on which the revolution was bottomed, he ceased to co-operate with them.

On the principle of rotation in office, the protestants put a strange construction: For whether a president has acted properly or improperly, his successor, they assert, "ought to be a man not immediately connected with him," in order that "the acts of the administration may be impartially reviewed; those which tend to promote the public good adopted, and those of a contrary tendency abandoned and exposed." "All other rotation (they tell us) is a mockery!"

It will readily be perceived that this declaration is directed against Mr. Jefferson. The general terms in which it is couched, do but superficially conceal the malignity of the attack. But I shall be glad to learn from these gentlemen with their new-fangled doctrines, at what political school they have lately studied, that they have been enabled to discover that an administration which the people have generally and publicly applauded; nay, almost adored, ought to be changed, merely for the purpose of examination? And who are the legitimate examiners of the excellence or evil tendency of an administration? Are not the people at large the judges, and the sole judges in the case? Would they not be the first to feel oppression and the first to oppose it? Have the people complained of the existing administration? Let the numerous addresses to the president from popular meetings; let the unsolicited declarations of the state legislatures answer the question. Why then, as the administration has been so much approved

of by the citizens throughout the Union, should not James Madison, a man "immediately connected with" Mr. Jefferson, succeed him? Who so likely, who so certain, to follow the same kind of policy, as the secretary of state? Does John Randolph believe that the people are mere creatures of caprice, that they will turn about and proclaim themselves hypocrites, by opposing James Madison, because he is "immediately connected with" Thomas Jefferson? Have they not solicited the latter to continue in office for another term; and is it credible that they would reject a man who will tread in his steps, and follow his political course? No, in truth! The people are sincere; they venerate Mr. Jefferson; they will support the man who will act as he has done: And, if I do not mistake them, they will spurn the men who endeavor to impose on their understandings by fiction and false flattery.

By their own terms the manifesto men have brought the cause to issue on this plain question, *Are the people satisfied with Mr. Jefferson's policy?* And as the people have already answered the question, it may be considered as decided in the affirmative.

But John Randolph, and Joseph Clay, and their associates, are not satisfied with his policy. They, therefore, are desirous of preventing the election of a man who would pursue the same rule of conduct.— Thus, then, it becomes a controversy between the body of the people on one side, and the Lilliputian band of seventeen on the other, which is to prevail in future: Whether we are to have the same course pursued by our executive that has been followed for eight years, or whether we are to have a new order of things, a non-

descript kind of politics, of which the people know nothing, which have been engendered in *terra incognita*, the Lord knows where; and of which, reversing the order of their present march, I suppose John Randolph is to be the head and Joseph Clay the tail. "All other rotation (they declare) is a mockery!"

And who is John Randolph? And who is James Madison? In the first we behold a stripling, flippant of tongue, irritable in feeling, rash in counsel, insolent in debate, a genius without judgment, a politician without discretion, the reviler of Thomas Jefferson, the friend of British doctrines, who has been quoted by our most deadly enemies as evidence of the correctness of their conduct, and who, putting sophistry into the mouths of English writers, has been one principal occasion of the ministry of Great Britain rising in their demands, keeping up a haughty tone against us, and placing us in the perilous situation in which we are at this moment. On the contrary, who is James Madison? An early, a revolutionary patriot; an active, intelligent legislator; a firm, enlightened statesman; always laboriously engaged for the good of his country, with his pen or his voice; endeavoring to keep down little animosities; engaging in no paltry, pitiful intrigues; resorting to no petty arts of the press to court popularity, standing on the basis of his own great talents, combatting the enemies of his country with all his skill and with all his abilities; holding terms with no man who holds no terms with the public good; the bosom friend of the illustrious Jefferson, in whose counsels he has long partaken, and whose highest esteem he has always enjoyed.

To conclude, no man can applaud the protest and at the same time be a sincere friend to the administration.

JOSEPH CLAY'S NOTE.

SIR,

I have seen in a paper edited by you, an account, purporting to be a statement of my obtaining leave of absence at the commencement of the present session of congress, and of the reasons of my return to the seat of government: The whole is a gross misrepresentation, and as far as respects the motives ascribed to me, a tissue of falsehoods. You are requested to publish this note.

JOSEPH CLAY.

House of Representatives,

March 4th, 1808.

Mr. Colvin.

To the honorable JOSEPH CLAY, Esquire.

SIR,

You have charged me with *gross misrepresentation* and *falsehood*. Considering that you are a *gentleman*, the terms of your accusation give us no very favorable idea of the decorum of your manners. If you had consulted your understanding in this instance, I doubt not you would have seen how very little weight of credibility the denial of an allegation receives from the use of angry expressions. I beg of you not to judge of my veracity by the extent of your own. I value the character of the Weekly Register too highly to venture an unequivocal assertion without authority to support it.

You will not suspect me of partiality for your political abilities. There are some testimonials in print (as, possibly, you may not have forgotten) of my opinion of your conduct and talents. It was not from any regret

that I felt for your absence from congress which induced me to pourtray you to the public. The grounds on which you acted struck me as fatal to the fundamental principle of elections, and in direct violation of that reciprocal bond which connected you with your constituents. In any other point of view you are a man of too little consideration to command my particular attention. Connected with others, I may possibly notice you in the crowd; and even individually you are not unworthy of being made an example for the benefit of your successors.

Sir, the position you assumed was truly alarming! You had obtained leave of absence for the whole session, excepting the few days you attended in the early part of it: And you repaired to Philadelphia, according to the general understanding, with the intention neither to resign your seat nor to return to Washington, previous to an adjournment. In the full security of your contemplated perfidy to the people, you exclaimed, (I am well advised of the fact,) '*If they are not represented, they shall not be misrepresented*;' an expression which betrayed at once both your resolution to depart from your duty and your supercilious scorn for your constituents.

I will not descend to an altercation with you about your *motives*: But I leave it for the public to decide of what complexion they must be, when you could so unblushingly desert your post without a resignation, for the purpose of exercising the duties of cashier of a bank for your own private emolument. I do not speak of a temporary or an indispensable absence from public service; but of an avowed and total dereliction of duty for the object of private gain.

To demonstrate to the community what little right you have to charge me with *gross misrepresentation* and *falsehood*, I here extract that passage of my Register which relates to your misdemeanor, and offer in support of it the vouchers that follow. I apprehend that by the time the people become acquainted with the whole case, you will bear a reputation for shameless effrontery fully equal to your character for veracity :

Extract from Colvin's Weekly Register
No. 7, page 110.

" *Thursday, Feb. 18, 1808.*—Mr. Joseph Clay, a representative from Philadelphia, reappeared and took his seat. This gentleman, after a few days attendance at the commencement of the session, obtained leave of absence, *sine die*, and returned to Philadelphia, where he exercised the office of cashier to a banking institution, leaving his constituents unrepresented. Justly offended at so glaring an attempt at imposition, the people of his district assembled, and took the affair into consideration. A memorial and remonstrance was drawn up (for he would not resign his seat) stating the case to the house of representatives, signatures were obtained, and the paper was about to be transmitted to this city, when Mr. Clay took fright, wrote a letter to the committee who had been appointed to draft the memorial and remonstrance that he would return to his duty, and came on accordingly."

Such are the assertions ; now for the proofs :

Extract from the Proceedings of Congress, Nov. 26, 1807.

" Mr. J. Clay obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the session."

Phila. March 8, 1808.

Mr. Colvin ;

Dr. Sir,

Your favor of the 5th instant I have this day received, and shall give you all the information I am in possession of. A notice was published, calling a meeting of the congressional district to consult as to the propriety of adopting some mode of conduct to secure the attendance of their representative. A meeting was held, a committee appointed to draught a memorial to congress, which they submitted to and was approved of by a subsequent public meeting, and the memorial put into circulation for subscribers. It progressed slowly, and in the mean while Mr. Clay received from the directors of the Bank of which he is Cashier, leave of absence, which he, as I am informed, communicated in a jesting way to one of the memorialling committee, and informed him that he would take on the memorial, &c. with him to Washington.

I never published the memorial or any of the proceedings : All that I published was as editor of the paper. The memorial was published in all the federal papers. As to the note of Joseph Clay's to the committee, that I have on mere report.

I am, Sir, respectfully, yours,

JOHN BINNS.

Mr. J. B. Colvin.

From a Philadelphia paper of Feb. 11.

The following memorial is now in circulation for signatures.

To the honorable the Speaker and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

The memorial and remonstrance of the freemen of the city and county of Philadelphia, and the county of

Delaware, composing the first congressional district of the state of Pennsylvania

Most respectfully sheweth—

That your memorialists, impressed with the importance of preserving unimpaired the right and exercise of free and equal representation, feel it a duty to express that the absence of Joseph Clay, Esq. one of their representatives, from your honorable house, *under leave to absent himself for the remainder of the session*, has excited serious anxiety; more especially, as, on inquiry, they have not been able to ascertain any reasonable or proper cause for his requiring such indulgence.—And, after a due reflection upon the probable tendency of so great a dereliction of duty to his constituents and to the country, they, with profound regard for the privileges of your honorable house, beg leave to solicit your consideration how much the same operates against the rights and interests of the people of this district,

No portion of the union perhaps, is more deeply interested in the measures of government, than the populous and wealthy city of Philadelphia, and the district connected therewith. And notwithstanding two members out of three to which it is entitled, are employing their talents and time in your honorable house, to promote the public good; yet this forms no apology for Mr. Clay's absence at a moment of solemn importance like the present; when the duties of the representatives of the people are greatly multiplied, in consequence of unhappy misunderstandings with foreign powers.

Since his election for the present and ensuing sessions, Mr. Clay has been appointed Cashier of the Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank, establish-

ed in this city; which office is well understood, and by his conduct is proved, to be entirely incompatible with those high trusts which are delegated to the representatives of the people.

Your memorialists do not remember any occurrence on which a more general and decided sentiment of disapprobation has been evinced, than the present. Not only this district and Pennsylvania, but the whole of the United States, may feel the influence of the dangerous example. The public Liberty cannot be preserved, but by a faithful and upright discharge of those functions which are established by the constitution and the laws.

That a representative of the people, who ought to be animated with patriot zeal in the promotion of their happiness, should leave his public duty and descend to the operations of a private institution, without giving up those powers with which his constituents have invested him, ought, in all times, to excite the uneasiness of freemen.

Your memorialists decline inquiring into any private considerations which may have induced said honorable member to withdraw himself from the house of representatives of the United States. Those they will leave to operate upon his own mind. But they cannot refrain from enforcing the propriety and constitutional necessity of a representative adhering with some degree of respectful regard, to those obligations which subsist between him and his constituents.

Presuming that your honorable house alone has an immediate controul over its members, your memorialists submit to your wisdom and justice the present state of the representation from this district as herein

exhibited, and they most respectfully pray for such relief as may seem consistent with the dignity and powers of the house of representatives of the United States and with the rights and liberties of the people.

All which is respectfully submitted.

From a Philadelphia paper of Feb. 20.

MEMBER OF CONGRESS.

COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

To the Freemen of the City and County of Philadelphia and County of Delaware.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

Having been appointed by you to prepare a memorial and remonstrance to the house of representatives of the United States, relative to the absence of Joseph Clay, Esq. we beg leave to

REPORT,

That said memorial and remonstrance has been circulated throughout the district for signatures: that it has met with the most satisfactory support, and is now in readiness to be transmitted. But, the honorable member having, by letter addressed to one of the committee, signified his determination forthwith to resume his seat in congress; and believing that to be in conformity with your wishes, we respectfully submit to you the expediency of staying the proceedings; as the object for which they were instituted, is answered as well by *his presence* at the seat of the general government, as by the expression of the public sentiment, which has been evinced.

*Peter Peres,
Joseph Grice,
James Withey,
Joshua Jones,
John Thompson,
Jos. Bennett Eves.*

Philadelphia, Feb. 19, 1808.

This, Sir, is my proof. The question is not a party one, but is interesting to the whole people of the United States.

It is rather unfortunate that the first conspicuous act of your political life, after your return, was that curious protest which, you will perceive, I have very carefully perused. I should have thought that the sarcasm contained in the report of the committee of your constituents would have taught you some humility. They plainly tell you, that your presence here is at once the evidence of your guilt and the acknowledgement of your disgrace. And yet you dare charge others with impropriety of conduct! If Mr. Binns' report may be credited, you are as capable of jesting at the just complaints as you are of insulting the understandings of your fellow citizens. But neither your solemn mockery of your obligations as a representative, nor your jests afterwards, can save you from exposure. "The same man (we are informed) may be treacherous without art, and a hypocrite without deceiving." The observation is in Junius: Your mirror will exhibit to you the living example.

You are, indeed, a man of importance! The cashier of a bank; and a representative in congress: and by alternate leave of absence, it seems, you are enabled to retain both situations! But I have done with you. Resign your seat in congress—get back to your banking-house, for in politics you are already a stockjobber.

JOHN B. COLVIN.

THE DUEL.—I shall offer no commentary by way of sermon, on the practice of duelling. It is a thing of feeling, and does not admit of reasoning. The man who has a quick sense of shame will resort to the duel,

whilst another, of more phlegmatic constitution, will condemn it. Every gentleman is the conservator of his own honor, and the sole judge of the most correct means of vindicating it. My object is simply to give a clear view of the origin, progress, and termination of the affair between Messrs. Campbell and Gardenier, in order that the public may perceive, at a single glance, the real cause and consequence of the encounter.

The majority of Congress who voted for the embargo law, had been most cruelly vilified from various quarters, and charged, both directly and indirectly, with being the servile tools of France, acting under the predominating influence of Bonaparte. Extracts of letters, purporting to be from members of congress, were published in different newspapers, announcing the charge with malignant reproach. One extract which had been inserted in the New York Evening Post, was attributed (with what correctness I do not know) to Mr. Gardenier. Another extract, avowedly from John Rowan, a member of congress from Kentucky, was published in the "Western World" and in other papers.

It was in vain that the futility of the charge was exposed; in vain that transpiring events in Europe were adduced to shew the propriety of the measure, independent of all other considerations. It was useless; the hue and cry was kept up; the majority were daily insulted and denounced. What was begun with closed doors was continued when they were opened. The minds of those who had voted for the embargo law became roused, and feelings of indignation succeeded those of the most unaganimous forbearance. In this temper of mind Mr. Gardenier did,

on Saturday, the 20th of February last, in a speech on the "bill in addition to the act, entitled an act supplementary to the act, entitled an act laying an embargo," &c. deliver himself as follows;

[MR. GARDENIER'S SPEECH.]

I shall vote in favor of the motion to commit; but not for precisely the same reasons which have been urged; but, as I apprehend, for reasons more powerful. It has struck me, sir, that the more we legislate on this subject, the worse we legislate—the more we legislate, the more we legislate to the destruction of the country. Why we passed the embargo law itself, I have always been unable to tell. Why we have passed subsequent laws for the purpose of rendering the original evil more perfect and more universal, God only knows. It does appear to me sir, that we are led on, step by step, by an unseen hand. We are urged forward by a secret spell to the ruin of our country. Under the name of an embargo we are in truth and in fact passing non-intercourse laws.—Under the beguiling form of a bill, supplemental to the embargo law, a law which prohibited the departure of vessels from your *ports and harbors*, you are about to prohibit all intercourse by land with any of the circumjacent territories of foreign nations. Between the original measure and this, there is no connexion: the principle of the one is totally different from the other. Nay sir, this bill is totally at variance with the president's embargo message. (*Mr. Gardenier here read the president's message of Dec. 21, 1807.*)

"The communications now made, showing the great and increasing dangers with which our vessels, our seamen and merchandize are threatened on the high seas, and else-

" where, from the belligerent powers of *Europe*; and it being of the greatest importance *to keep in safety these essential resources*, I deem it my duty to recommend the subject to the consideration of congress, who will doubtless perceive all the advantage which may be expected from an inhibition of the departure of our *vessels from the ports* of the U. States."

To prevent our ships and vessels from leaving their ports, for the purpose of preserving them as resources to meet a state of war, if that should ultimately come, was all that the president *professed* to have in view, all that he wished us to do, at least at that time. And I state it to the everlasting honor of the minority on that occasion, and as long as I live I shall be proud of the share I had in that honor, that to resist even that law, we sat day after day and night after night. I cannot, therefore, possessing now the same opinions which governed me then, opposed as I still am to the existence of the embargo act, I cannot consent to go on, for the purpose of extending the operation of the evil more widely—for the purpose of making that worse which is already too bad. But this is different from our embargo law. It is a non-intercourse bill. The more the original measure develops itself, the more I am satisfied that my first view of it was correct; that it was a *shy, cunning* measure. That its real object was not merely to prevent our vessels from going out—but to effect a non-intercourse. Are the nation prepared for *this*? If you wish to try whether they are, tell them at once what is your object—tell them what you mean—tell them you mean to take part with the grand pacificator. Or else stop your present course.

Do not go on forging chains to fasten us to the car of the imperial conqueror. [Here Mr. Smilie, Mr. G. W. Campbell, Mr. J. Montgomery, and several others, rose together, some calling to order, and others very wrathfully hoping the gentleman might proceed.]

The Speaker hoped the gentleman would keep within the rules of propriety.

Mr. Gardenier hoped the Speaker would keep order in the house, [three gentlemen were still standing] for (said Mr. G.) it is impossible for me, sir, to *speak and keep order* in the house at the same time. (The confusion having ceased, Mr. Gardenier proceeded.) If the gentlemen have composed themselves, and are in a condition to hear, I will proceed. I wish first, however, to put them at ease on one point. They are not of sufficient importance to have been the objects at whom I would level any thing. I assure the gentlemen I did not mean them.

This, sir, whatever name or complexion it may bear, is in fact a non-intercourse bill. The measure it proposes can be of no possible benefit to us. It has nothing in it to render palatable the distress it must bring on a considerable portion of our citizens. I object particularly against the fourth section. It forbids the exportation of our produce *by land*, in which mode there is no danger of capture. When we passed the embargo act, it was done with a view not to stop trade, but was *professed* to be done with a view to keep safe *our resources*. The stopping of trade by water was not the *object*, however it may have been the inevitable *consequence* of the embargo. It was an evil necessarily resulting from it. The majority were willing to endure this *evil*, in consideration of the eventual *good* which

would result from keeping (as the president expresses it) in safety our essential resources. But as one mad measure usually begets more, so, in the present instance, it has happened that the original object of the embargo, ruinous as it was, is abandoned, and gentlemen seemed to vie with each other in their endeavors to render our situation in every respect intolerable. I ask the intelligent and candid men of this house, whether to prevent the farmers of Vermont from selling their pigs in Canada is calculated to increase or diminish their essential resources. Whether the object which the president *professed* to have in view is counteracted by a traffic of this kind. No, sir, it is not only in direct hostility to the interests of the country, but what some gentlemen will probably regard quite as much, to the wishes of the president. I repeat it; the objects of the bill, particularly of the fourth section, and of the embargo, are totally distinct.

Instead of measures of this description; instead of fettering commerce; instead of putting their ingenuity to the rack in devising means to paralyze completely all the commercial activity of the country, I should have been happy to have perceived the gentlemen who manage matters in this house: I should have been glad to have perceived in the administration, a disposition to encourage as much commercial activity as could be possibly consistent with the *professed* objects of the president—the safe keeping of our resources. I should have been happy to have found them content with the ruin and distress their darling project had already produced, without aiming at the utter, the total, stagnation of all the commercial powers of the political body. But, unhappily, instead of ameliorating, we go on to make worse and

worse the condition of our devoted country. Suppose Vermont should send some of her produce to Canada; or Georgia to the Floridas; in what are the interests of the rest of the union to suffer by it? Or are we to go on passing these laws, zealous in our exertions to make bad worse, upon the principle, which some gentlemen in this house have very gravely advanced, that we ought to make the public suffering, as equal (in other words) as universal as possible—to extend it to every nook and corner of the union; that no portion, no section however remote, however secluded, should escape from taking its due proportion of the *bitter draught*; none, which the fatal gangrene should not reach? If we ARE running mad, sir, we have at least this consolation—we have “*method* in our madness.”

It is strange, it astonishes me, that by an embargo, we should be led to the measure contemplated in this bill. Because you wish to preserve your vessels and seamen, those essential resources, in your sea ports, you are therefore to prohibit all trafficking across your territorial lines; though it is evident that by permitting it, your citizens, of course your country, will be benefitted. Sir, I cannot express my amazement at the dreadful infatuation which pervades the public councils. I conjure the members of this assembly to cease for a moment their exertions—I conjure them to sheath the destroying sword; in the name of our suffering country, I entreat them to save it from these new and accumulating evils. The great object of your president is secured. Leave a little to your distressed people. Do not, I implore you, permit yourselves to be persuaded, that the public interest cannot be subserved, unless every body is destroyed.

I doubt whether experience has

proved, that the original law was for the public interest. Hitherto our ships might have navigated the ocean in safety. But at any rate, is it wise to hazard every thing upon the experiment? for at best it is but an experiment. If it shall be proved ultimately to have been a good measure, it will also prove to have been strong enough to produce good enough to satisfy every rational theorist. If a bad one, it will have produced calamity enough, full as much as our poor country can stagger under.

I have in view no object but my country's good—and when I see it threatened on every side, it is my duty to speak out boldly and earnestly to this house and to this nation. And I will again entreat gentlemen to reflect whether the continual extension of the non-intercourse system is calculated to make us better prepared to engage in a war either with France or Great Britain? For upon that ground was the original measure of the embargo demanded by the president; upon that ground only could it even be plausibly defended. Sir, it is high time to stop. We have done enough.

If it is wise to contrive that every part of the country should suffer; if this strange notion be indeed good policy, I could wish gentlemen would, instead of bolting at me in the fulness of their rage, endeavor to satisfy my poor understanding by cool reasoning, that they are right. That they would show me how this measure would prepare for war—how the weakening, by distressing every part of the country, is to increase its strength and its vigor. No—I cannot be deceived in the view I have taken of this measure, and I will not cease to protest against it with all the energies with which I am possessed.

I am grieved to see that we are perpetually engaged in making additions and supplements to the embargo law. Wherever we can espy a hole, if it be no bigger than a wheat straw, at which the industry and enterprize of our country can find vent, all our powers are called into requisition to stop it up. The people of this country shall sell nothing but what they sell to each other.—All our surplus produce shall rot on our hands. God knows what all this means! I, sir, cannot understand it. I am astonished—indeed I am astonished and dismayed. I see effects; but I can trace them to no cause. *Yes, sir, I do fear that there is an unseen hand, which is guiding us to the most dreadful destinies—unseen, because it cannot endure the light.* Darkness and mystery overshadow this house and this whole nation. We know nothing—we are permitted to know nothing. We sit here as mere automata; we legislate without knowing,—nay, sir, without wishing to know, why or wherefore. We are told what we are to do, and the *council of five hundred* do it—We move, but why or wherefore, no man knows; we are put in motion—but how, I for one cannot tell.

Sir! the gentlemen of this house with whom I have the honor to act, and a distinguished honor I consider it, are disposed to do all that men can do for their country.—But we wish to know **WHAT** we are doing—the tendency of the measures we are called upon to adopt. If the motives and the principles of the administration are honest and patriotic, we would support them with a fervor which none could surpass. But, sir, we are kept in total darkness. We are treated as the enemies of our country. We are permitted to know nothing, and execrated because we

do not approve of measures, the origin and tendency of which are carefully concealed from us? We are denounced because we have no confidence in the executive, at the moment the executive refuses to discover to us—even this house—nay sir, this nation, its actual condition.—Like the Israelites in Egypt, we are to make brick, and find our own straw. We are to have faith, and find out our own reasons for it. This course will do in this country no longer. [The Speaker called Mr. G. to order. Mr. W. Alston wished the gentleman might be permitted to proceed.] Mr. Gardenier—I do not desire permission of that gentleman. I shall permit myself to proceed. I have wandered, sir, through a wide field, I confess, I return to this bill. I wish to soften its asperities—to make its operations more mild. Particularly to have the fourth section expunged. I will therefore vote for its commitment.

—
Such is the speech of Mr. Gardenier. I copy it, with its illustrations and embellishments, from the United States' Gazette, as I have understood it appeared in that paper in a form the most pleasing and satisfactory to the orator. On Mr. G.'s concluding, Mr. John Montgomery (of Maryland) shortly after rose and observed—

Now, at this late hour, charges of a very serious nature against the house have been made on this floor by a gentleman from New York. Not on this day are they made for the first time; they have been sent abroad in the public prints. It is important to know how those charges originated. At this late hour they cannot be repelled. Let us pursue this course on this awful business; let the question be carried over; let the

house now adjourn. At our next meeting let us take up, and if those charges can be proven, if we are indeed so abandoned, so profligate, so destitute of patriotism, so dead to every thing which concerns the interest of our country, let us be stamped with infamy and sent home to our constituents. The crisis is serious and calls for the attentive deliberation of the house. Let the gentleman from New York establish his charges; if he does so, I for one will say those persons under this secret influence must be immediately expelled the house: If he does not, some other course may be taken in relation to that gentleman.

—
On the Monday following, (Feb. 22d,) the same bill being before the house, with a motion for recommitment, Mr. Johnson (of Kentucky) made the following observations:

[MR. JOHNSON'S SPEECH.]

Mr. Johnson, after some preliminary remarks, observed:

I have, since I have been here, on all occasions voted from a sense of duty, and upon evidence derived from sources accessible to all.—I am a friend to liberal discussion and freedom of debate; but I am an enemy to insinuations unfounded and attacks unprovoked. I know that in the ardor of debate expressions may have escaped the lips of myself or any gentleman; I may have been betrayed into an hurried expression, in which, perhaps, upon retrospection I might not feel myself justified but from the ardor of debate. But a direct charge against any members on this floor, tending to put them in a degraded and infamous view, is contrary to honorable conduct and cannot be excused, much less can it be justified. I have differed in opinion with gentlemen on this floor; and

notwithstanding this difference I respect them individually, so far as I am acquainted with them and so far as they have treated me with that politeness due from one gentleman to another. I should consider myself as derogating from the dignity of a representative, were I to level a reflection against any member because he differed from me in political sentiment. But what expressions have we heard on a subject on which they were not applicable, when every one of all parties seemed to join to render the embargo as effectual as a national measure should be? To this house and to those who vote for the measure, have been applied the observations that an invisible hand guided us; that we were told what was wanting and that the council of five hundred voted it; that we are governed by foreign influence; that our steps are marked by folly and madness; that we are forging chains to bind us to the triumphal car of the French emperor; that we are mere automata; that we wait for the word of command and we obey. Expressions of this kind I never expected to hear on this floor. Such expressions I never expected to hear from the representative of a free people; and I pronounce them derogatory to the republican character and highly reprehensible. If by such expressions the gentleman means to charge me, or if any man shall say that I am governed by any other impulse than duty, or influenced by any other motives than my own, I say that I consider it a base and unprincipled calumny. And what I have said I am glad that I did not say till this morning, because it is now deliberately done. A member may say what he pleases with respect to himself; that he is governed by such or such influence. But when a charge

is made that I am governed by any other impulse than that of an American, and that I am a tool to the will of others, I pronounce it a slander. Under this impression I make this reply. And I would be understood, that if any one considers himself injured, or the resentment of any gentleman is awakened by any thing which I have said, that I do not consider myself as shielded by the splendid walls which surround me, nor by the privileges of a member. What I have said I shall not retract.

—
Mr. Rhea (of Tenn.) then offered some pertinent strictures; exposed the looseness of Mr. Gardenier's remarks, and justified the embargo on the soundest maxims of policy.

—
Mr. Newton next entered into a handsome elucidation of the causes which led to the embargo, pourtrayed the excellence of that measure in very glowing terms, and wound up with the following impressive apostrophe:

Foreign influence is likewise pressed into service—the efficacy of its magic is tried—it ranks among the political panacea of the day—but from whence, sir, does the accusation flow?—is this serious and weighty charge brought against us by those worthies who achieved the independence of their country? No—the greater number of those worthies are with us. Is that class of citizens, who have raised themselves into notice and importance by years of devotion to public service, numbered among our accusers? No—the greatest number of that class is also on the same side of the question with us. I have no skill in finding out motives—the science is too mysterious and occult for the dimness of my intellectual vision—the abortive

attempts which I have so often witnessed, have disqualified me from putting in my pretensions for distinction and promotion. I trust, sir, that such language must proceed either from the intemperance of discussion, or from a misconception of the American character, which can never descend from the elevated station of independence to become the pander or the puppet of despots.

[MR. G. W. CAMPBELL'S SPEECH.]

Mr. G. W. Campbell said it was with more than usual reluctance he rose to address the house on this occasion, and nothing but a sense of duty would impel him to enter into a discussion, in which it might be necessary to notice charges made against a majority of the house, of the senate, and against the government in general; which, if true, ought to be proved and made known to the public, so as to produce a total renovation in the national councils; and if false, ought to consign their authors to that disgraceful infamy which such conduct was calculated to draw upon them; and in fact should mark them out as common calumniators, and hold them forth as fit objects for national contempt. The petty scribblers in the party newspapers have been engaged for some time in circulating reports of French influence over the councils of the nation; these charges were in themselves so destitute of even the semblance of truth, so totally unfounded, and unsupported by any facts to give them the color of probability, that they made little or no impression on the public mind, and were rejected as slanderous falsehoods, the mere offspring of malignity, as generally as they were known. The more respectable prints of the same party refuted these charges and

treated them with that contempt which they deserved. They therefore received no serious notice from those against whom they were made, and there appeared to be a general disposition to suffer them to sink into that silent oblivion to which the good sense of the nation would most certainly have consigned them. But when those charges are borrowed from those petty scribblers, and echoed and repeated on this floor, by a person having the honor of a seat in the house, it is high time they should be noticed; to be longer silent would be criminal. Issue is now joined, and the guilty, whoever they may be, whether the accused or the accuser, must stand forth before the nation, stripped of their mask of concealment, to receive the sentence of public indignation, that will frown them with contempt into obscurity. For there is no medium in this case, the accusers or the accused must be guilty—must be enemies to their country; and it is high time the nation, the people of America, should know their friends from their foes. The crisis calls for it, the duty we owe the people calls for it, and the honor and dignity of this house demand that the guilty should be exposed. If the charges can be supported that any portion of the members of this house are acting under foreign influence, let the people know it, let them change their representatives, let them send men of integrity, who are superior to the secret influence of a foreign power; but if on the contrary these allegations are found to be false and unfounded, then let the nation know this and let the finger of scorn point at those who have published such groundless falsehoods, and render them the objects of public contempt and detestation. This subject is now fairly before the public, and he who

had made such serious charges on this floor, charges that the majority of this house is acting under the impulse of French or Gallic influence, will it be presumed produce to this house and the nation, and he is now called upon to do so, the proofs, the evidence or facts that support those charges, and if these are not produced, it must be considered by this house and by the nation, that there are no such proofs or facts, and that therefore these charges are groundless calumnies circulated abroad at this important crisis by the enemies of this country, to distract the public mind and destroy the confidence of the people in their government, which would palsify the energies of the nation, and render it more vulnerable to the attacks of a foreign enemy.

[Mr. Campbell then took an able survey of the embargo law—the policy upon which it was bottomed—the necessity for its existence, from the present state of the belligerent powers—declaring that he had hitherto been silent from the conviction that the reasons for it were self-evident, and that he had been drawn out to an explanation of his motives only by the charges made on the floor of the house of the prevalence of French influence among the majority, which he pronounced “infamous, groundless falsehoods.”—Mr. Campbell then continued as follows:]

No man of sense can suppose that France would wish or dictate a measure that would produce as great, if not greater injury to herself than to her enemy. Such a supposition would be next to madness. From these considerations, it would be supposed that no man, who had made himself in any degree acquainted with the situation of this country in regard to the belligerent powers, and had considered

the effects that this measure would have on them, could for a moment entertain the opinion, or even hazard a conjecture that it was adopted under the influence of any foreign power, much less under that of France. The allegation is so wild, so inconsistent in itself—so destitute of the least semblance of probability, and altogether unsupported by the least shadow of proof, that nothing but the basest malignity of heart could engender and publish so shameless, foul and infamous a falsehood; and yet, sir, said Mr. Campbell, it has been echoed on this floor—sounded in your ears in the frantic strains of a raving maniac, and in the discussion of a subject, no ways calculated to excite such extraordinary passions. Hence it may be supposed it was a premeditated scheme to seize on that occasion in order to give vent to those vindictive passions against the government and the republicans of this nation, which seem entirely to occupy and engross the minds of certain persons. In noticing what was said by the member from New York, I beg to be understood, as not considering these statements as deriving any sort of consequence or importance from him who made them here. It is not on that account that they merit or receive the least notice. That person can only be considered as the mere conduit used by those behind the screen to convey these groundless slanders to the public—the common trumpeter who gives no importance to what he makes public, except what is derived merely from the place he occupies, or the duties assigned him to perform. It is not therefore apprehended that what has been said on this occasion by that member will make any other or stronger impression on the public mind than was

made by the same tale, when handed to the public through the medium of party or hireling newspapers.

[Mr. Campbell then offered a few pertinent observations in favor of the additional supplementary bill; and concluded by saying that "Those who oppose the true interests of their country on every occasion in their power, are rivetting on themselves chains of infamy that they never can shake off." Messrs. Alexander and Bibb afterwards made a few remarks, when Mr. John Montgomery (of Maryland) rose, and spoke in the following manner :]

[MR. J. MONTGOMERY'S SPEECH.]

Mr. Montgomery said, that before the adjournment of the house on Saturday, a base and infamous charge had been made by a member from New York (Mr. Gardenier) against the honor and dignity of the executive and congress relative to the adopting the measure of the embargo, that the indecorous language then used had excited the honest indignation of the whole house, a motion was made for an adjournment, for the avowed purpose of affording an opportunity to the member from N. York, of adducing proof and satisfying the nation of the validity of the unprincipled charge; that he had designedly kept his seat, and impatiently waited for the member to rise and exhibit his testimony; he had waited in vain. Can the member (Mr. M. asked) produce to this house a single individual who has ever seen a solitary document in possession of the executive, relating to and having a bearing on our relations with France, and which it is important for the information of congress or the nation, the executive should have communicated, and which they have wilfully concealed?

Can he shew a particle of evidence to excite the slightest belief that the proceedings of the government have flowed from a mandate of a Napoleon, or from the influence of any foreign potentate on earth, or that they have been actuated by any influence other than a sacred, solemn and honorable sense of duty, and with a view solely directed to promote the best interests, protect the inestimable rights, and provide for the common defence of our common country? If he has such testimony, why does he not exhibit it? His total inability to do so, and his failing to do so, must be conclusive to the minds of the spectators who surround us, to this house and to the nation, that the charge is insolent, false and unfounded. If true, merited odium and national distrust ought to attach upon us; if untrue, and I again pronounce it so, public detestation will be levelled at him for the indecency and wantonness of his attack. But the strong and indignant language of reprobation which has this morning been so forcibly applied to this most unworthy imputation, renders it unnecessary to say much more on this occasion. At the moment, on Saturday, when the honest feelings of strong indignation were excited in the House by the malignant and unprovoked and slanderous assertions; another, a more serious mode of proceeding* had suggested itself, but on reflection, when the futility and idleness of the charge was considered, and more especially the source from whence it originated and proceeded, it is judged the most eligible course for this House to pursue, to treat it with disdain, and consign it to national execration and contempt.

* A resolution of expulsion had been mentioned.

A Statement of the affair between Mr. Gardenier and Mr. Campbell.

On the 23d day of February Mr. Gardenier addressed to Mr. George W. Campbell the following note :

City of Washington, Feb. 23, 1808.

Sir—It would be as impossible as it would be painful to me to remind you of all the expressions in which you indulged yourself concerning me in the debate in the House of Representatives yesterday. Among them were charges of *falsehood*, meanness and *baseness*. I have allowed you one night to reflect on the intemperance of such language, and I must insist that you will either disavow the expressions alluded to, to the satisfaction of my friend, Mr. White, or through him authorise me to consider them as having been avowed out of the walls of the House. I am your obedient servant,

B. GARDENIER.

G. W. Campbell, Esq.

To this Note Mr. George W. Campbell returned the following answer :

Washington, Feb. 23, 1808.

Sir—Your note of this morning has just been received. In answer to which I have only to say that any expressions used by me will never be disavowed. The circumstance that produced the expressions which I used must be fresh in your recollection. The charge made on Saturday by you that a majority of the House, of whom I was one, were governed by French influence. Had the same charge been made in any other place I should have used the same expressions in answer to it. I am, sir, your most obdt.

GEO. W. CAMPBELL.

B. Gardenier, Esq.

To this note Mr. Gardenier returned the following answer :

Washington, Feb. 23, 1808.

SIR,

I acknowledge the receipt of your note in answer to mine of this morning—after declaring, "That any expression used by you will never be disavowed," you have in that note entered into a justification of those expressions. I am no less surprised now to find that you persist in imputing to me a charge I never made, than I was yesterday to hear you say the same thing. In my note of this morning, I desired you either to disavow the offensive expressions made in the House, or to avow them out of the House. You have as yet done neither. You have merely said "Had the same charge been made in any other place, I should have used the same expressions." This is no avowal of the expressions out of the House ; because it does not suppose a state of things in which the expressions could have been applied to me. I am therefore under the necessity of repeating the request contained in my note of this morning for the last time. I am, Sir, your obdt.

B. GARDENIER.

G. W. Campbell, Esq.

In answer to this letter Mr. G. W. Campbell authorised his friend to deliver to the friend of Mr. Gardenier, the following message.

I am authorised by Mr. George W. Campbell, to make known to Mr. Gardenier, through you, that in regard to the affair which was the subject of his note of the 23d, and his letter of the same day, Mr. Campbell will claim no advantage of any privilege he may possess as a member of the House ; and this, with the answer of Mr. Campbell to Mr. Gardenier's first note, is the only answer deemed proper to be made to his letter of the same date.

This message was delivered to the

friend of Mr. Gardenier at 12 o'clock on the 24th; and on the same day Mr. Gardenier sent the following note:

Washington City, Feb. 24, 1808.

Sir—Mr. Eppes has this moment delivered to my friend, Mr. White, a message from you, in consequence of which I have to request of you to make arrangements for meeting me as speedily as your convenience will permit.

I am, sir, your obedient,

B. GARDENIER.

G. W. Campbell, Esq.

In answer to this note Mr. George W. Campbell authorised his friend to deliver to the friend of Mr. Gardenier the following message:

I am authorised on the part of Mr. George W. Campbell to say that he will meet Mr. Gardenier at such time and place as may be agreed on between us.

This message was delivered in about three quarters of an hour after receiving Mr. Gardenier's last note.

On the following day the friends of the parties in consequence of a previous arrangement, met on the top of the hill near George Town, and rode along the main road leading to Montgomery Court House until they passed the territorial line. A spot was fixed on just out of the district of Columbia and not far from the road leading to Montgomery Court House. The friends of the parties arranged, without any difficulty or difference of opinion, the time, place and manner of meeting. The parties appeared on the ground before the appointed time. The appearance of a number of persons prevented them from carrying into effect the object of their meeting. Finding it impossible at that time to proceed, it was agreed on the ground that a new meeting should take place. The parties returned to the City of Washington, and about 9

o'clock at night Mr. White presented to Mr. Eppes the following note for Mr. Campbell.

Washington City, Feb. 27, 1808.

Sir—A new arrangement in consequence of the unfortunate interruption which happened to day becomes indispensable. You will of course consent that our friends Mr. White and Mr. Eppes proceed to make it with all possible dispatch. I need not state the causes which render this of the first necessity.

I am your obdt. servant,

B. GARDENIER.

G. W. Campbell, Esq.

To this note the friend of George W. Campbell returned the next morning the following answer:

February 28, 1808.

Sir—Mr. Gardenier's note of last evening has been presented to Mr. George W. Campbell. I shall be ready on his part to make the necessary arrangements with all possible dispatch. I am your most obedient,

JOHN W. EPPES.

Mr. White.

The publicity given to the affair by the first unsuccessful attempt to meet on the Montgomery road, and the interposition afterwards of the civil authority of the district, delayed the second meeting a few days. A place having been fixed on without the district, the parties repaired to Bladensburg after night the evening preceding their meeting. They met the next morning, (March the 2d,) at the place appointed, took their stations, fired nearly at the same time, and Mr. Gardenier was severely wounded. Every thing was conducted on the ground with the utmost propriety. To prevent misrepresentations this statement is signed by the friends of the parties.

JOHN W. EPPES,

SAMUEL WHITE.